UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/744,169	04/19/2001	Theresa Ann Jeary	P24,622 USA	3922

7590 11/30/2005

Alexis Barron
Synnestvedt & Lechner
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950

EXAMINER	
TRAN, SUSAN T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1615	

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/744,169	JEARY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan T. Tran	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 September 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,5,20,23-40,45-51 and 55-63* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,5,20,23-40,45-51 and 55-63* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/02/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 23, 24, 28-30 and 55-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. It appears from the specification that the weight gain of the rate-controlling membrane is from 11-450% (see page 13, 1st paragraph). The percent weight grain recites in the claims having the limit "from about 4% to about 15%" does not appear to have support from the specification.

Furthermore, it appears that applicant's specification does not provide adequate support for the specific range of blood serum of from "about 275 to about 1,900 ng/ml.h" in claim 59.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "and wherein" at the end of the claim is confusing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 20, 23-40, 45-51 and 55-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norling et al. US 5,958,458, in view of Van Balken et al. US 6,183,780.

Norling teaches a pharmaceutical multiparticulate formulation in the form of coated cores (abstract). The core is in the form of pellets, comprising active agent and

excipient (columns 2, lines 33-42; and column 13, lines 29-67). The active agent includes antidepressants (column 6, lines 35-40). The coated multiparticulate is formulated into oral solid dosage form including tablet, capsule, powder or granule suitable to release active agent during a 24 hours period (column 13, lines 20-36). Suitable coating polymers includes ethyl cellulose, Eudragit® E, Eudragit® RS or RL, polyvinyl acetate phthalate (columns 9-10).

It is noted that the Norling does not expressly teach the release profiles. However, products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada* 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Accordingly, it is the position of the examiner that the release profile is inherent because Norling teaches the use of the same rate control release polymer, *e.g.*, Eudragit® E, Eudragit® RS or RL.

Norling does not explicitly teach fluvoxamine in the composition.

Van Balken teaches an oral delayed immediate release formulation comprising active core coated with rate control release polymer (columns 5-6). The active agent in the core is an antidepressant, *e.g.,* fluvoxamine (column 5, lines 24-25). Thus, it would have been prima facie obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify pharmaceutical multi-particulate formulation of Norling using fluvoxamine as an antidepressant in view of the teaching of Van Balken, because the references teach that antidepressant can be incorporated in an extended release formulation, such as coated

beads/pellets. The expected result would be a slow/controlled release formulation containing antidepressants drug having prolonged release rate.

It is noted that the Norling does not expressly teach the release profiles as well as the blood serum level. However, products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada* 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). Accordingly, the burden is shifted to applicant to show that the composition of Norling would not exhibit the claimed properties, because Norling teaches the use of the same rate control release polymer, *e.g.*, Eudragit® E, Eudragit® RS or RL.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/02/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that theophylline is not chemically similar to fluvoxamin, either in property or in structure. Different compounds are expected to have different release profiles. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one

cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The rejection is based on the combined references. Norling teaches compositions that are identical to the claimed composition (see applicant's remark at page 13, 3rd paragraph) using antidepressant drug. Norling is combined with Van Balken for the teaching that fluvoxamine is a well-known antidepressant. Accordingly, applicant has not shown that the combined references would not exhibit the claimed release profiles.

Pertinent Arts

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Janenicke et al., and Skinhoj et al. are cited as of interest for the teachings of sustained release composition for fluvoxamine.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan T. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-0606. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R from 6:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page, can be reached at (571) 272-0602. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S. Tran
Patent Examiner
AU 1615